



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,353	08/15/2001	Wen-Tsung Liu	LIUW3001/EM/7128	8865
23364	7590	11/19/2004	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/929,353

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attache.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 11/04/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection of Claims 1-5 in view of USP 6,567,273 (Liu et al).

Applicant argued the '273 patent do not recite a network card can "detect, judge, and support action signals.

Examiner points out that the '273 patent discloses a bridging chip detects the USB plug is inserted into a computer [col 4 lines 54; col 5 lines 35] or the equivalent of a CPU /a electronic circuit board is programmed to detect and control signaled was well-known in the art. It was obvious that the levels of detect, control or judge and support action signal (or interface) is a design choice of the software of the bridging chip and it is unpatentable. Thus, the Double Patenting rejection is sustained.

Rejection of claims 1,2,4 and 5 in view of Ohara:

Applicant argues the prior art does not teach the card interface with the first computing device and the second end connected to the second computing device.

Examiner points out the prior art discloses a NIC has two interfaces which connected to the other computing devices but not limit to facsimile, laptop, printer, modem, transceiver, router etc., [Ohara Fig 1], Applicant arguments based on the different type of interfaces (i.e.: a single ends to supports two hosts and can be controlled by either) is well-known in computer fields where the two computers configured to connect to a network printer either serial or parallel interfaces [Ohara Fig

Art Unit: 2142

1]. Examiner considers a printer is a computing device (i.e.: a electronic device with control circuits such as CPU, RAM, ROM and interfaces).

Rejections of claim 3 in view of Ohara-Chang:

Applicant argues the control chip could execute commands supplied through either interface at either ends.

Examiner notes that the NIC has two end interfaces and both ends could transmitted and received signals [Chang, the inner circuit board 831, the interface connector 833, the outer signal connector 832, 815, col 4 lines 5-30, Fig 4b].

Rejection of claims 1,2,4,5 in view of Bermanian:

Applicant argued the prior art does not teach the first and second computing device and the card including a micro chip that detects, judges and executes commands supplied through either interface at either end.


Examiner points out the NIC/modem card could be either an external or internal device or PCMCIA card as a design choice. The NIC/modem card has a CPU and software driver to control, judge and execute command or signal through the network interface [Bamanian, the router perform a bridging function so that different types of networks such as Ethernet, Token Ring, FDDI, ISDN etc., col 4 lines 32-43; the two network interface boards or modules, col 4 lines 60-65; on-chip DMA controller, col 12 lines 23-39]. It was obvious a high speed-parallel CPU could handle multi-threads from either end which is equivalent to a router with plurality of interfaces connect to the

Art Unit: 2142

different type of computer devices and control, judge, execute command from either devices was well-known art.

Thus, the rejection is sustained.

*Thong Vu*  
*Patent Examiner*  
*Art Unit 2142*

  
JACK HARVEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER